

### REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were examined in the outstanding office action mailed on 05/21/2007 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). Applicants note with appreciation that claim 7 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-6 and 8-24 were rejected. The specification was objected to.

By virtue of this paper, the specification and claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 13, 18, and 20 are sought to be amended, and claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 12, 19, 22 and 23 are sought to be canceled. The amendments and cancellations are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-11, 13-18, 20-21 and 24 are thus respectfully presented for reconsideration.

### *Specification*

The Abstract was objected to noting that line 3 there includes a typographical error "upto". The term is sought to be replaced by "up to" and withdrawal of the objection with respect to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

Paragraph [0020] was objected to noting that the text there includes a typographical error "wellstructures". The term is sought to be replaced by "well known structures" as also interpreted by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objections with respect to the Specification is respectfully requested.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112*

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, it was stated that:

In amended claims 1 and 8, the added limitation "wherein each of said parameters has a corresponding value for each of a plurality of sub-portions of the respective signal portion

received on each of said plurality of antennas" (e.g. claim 1, lines 12-13) is confusing since it is unclear as to whether it is applicant's intention to indicate each parameter has corresponding value for each sub-portion of each signal portion on each antenna (i.e. each antenna receives a signal portion comprising multiple sub-portions, and generating a corresponding set of parameters for each sub-portion) or the "plurality of sub-portions" refers to the sub-portions received on each of the plurality of antennas (i.e. the plurality of sub-portions counts the sub-portion received on each of the plurality). For examination on the merits, the claim will be interpreted as the latter.  
(Page 3, lines 1-11 of the Final Office Action)

For the convenience of the Examiner, the term of above is explained with respect to Figure 3 of the subject application in an example scenario.

Two signal portions (s1 and s2) may be received in corresponding time durations. S1 may be received via antenna 150 and s2 via antenna 160. Even within s1, at each time interval (sub-portion), the signal would have corresponding values for the strength and correlation parameters. Similarly, within s2, at each time interval, the signal would have corresponding values for the strength and correlation parameters.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 with respect to claims 1 and 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 was rejected stating as follows:

In amended claim 18, the "means for generating limitation" indicates that the first and third parameters represent a respective correlation of said non-payload portion, but then also indicates that the third and fourth parameters represent a respective strength of said signal received via said first and second antennas (lines 8-12). This is confusing since the third parameter represents two different entities and the second parameter does not represent anything. For examination on the merits, ***the claim will be interpreted such that the first and third parameters represent a respective correlation (as claimed) and the second and fourth parameters represent a respective strength of said signal.***  
(Page 3, lines 13-20 of the Final Office Action, ***Emphasis Added***)

Claim 18 is sought to be amended consistent with the Examiner's interpretation in the above emphasized portion. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 with respect to claim 18 is respectfully requested.

5

***Allowable Subject Matter***

In paragraph 12 on page 10 of the Final Office Action, it was noted that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten independent form.

10 Currently amended independent claim 1 contains, at least substantially, the features recited in claim 7 and the intervening claims 2 and 6. Accordingly, currently amended claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

15 Currently amended independent claims 8 and 18 are also sought to be amended to at least substantially include the features of claim 7. Accordingly both the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from the respective base claims. The various rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103 are rendered moot in view of the foregoing amendments

20

***Conclusion***

25 Accordingly all the objections and rejections of record are believed to be overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is accordingly requested to pass this case to issuance. The Examiner is invited to telephone Mr. Jim Brady at (972)917-4371 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully Submitted,  
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/  
Signature  
Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta  
Registration Number: 41,416  
Date: December 24, 2007